

Clark County Sustainable Communities

Stakeholders Meeting #4

January 21, 2010 4-6 pm

CTRAN Fisher's Landing Passenger Service Office

Rose Besserman Room, 3510 SE 164th Avenue, Vancouver WA

Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Anya Caudill, Dept of Ecology

Gordy Euler, Clark County

Laura Hudson, City of Vancouver

Marty Snell, Clark County

Mike Bomar, BIA

Mike Selig, Clark County

Ron Onslow, City of Ridgefield

Steve Stuart, Clark County

Jim Carlson, VECOS

Leah Greenwood, Affordable Community Ennv.

Mark Basham, Basham Woodworks

Mike Turnauer

Patrick Sughrue, Structures NW

Roy Johnson, Vancouver Housing Authority

Ryan Zygar, Tamarack Homes

Sandra Sonksen, Locals

Amy Dvorak, MFA

Chuck Dougherty, Synergy Design

Debbie Dover, Second Step Housing

Staff in Attendance

Pete DuBois, Clark County

Katie Spataro, Cascadia

Adrienne DeDona, JLA

Kelly Skelton, JLA

Agenda items:

- Welcome, introductions, meeting agenda and purpose
- Background on the SARD project
- Sustainable Communities project vision, goals, and desired outcomes
 - Concurrent process at local government level
- Local builders leading the way: lessons learned
- Developing tools to support builders/developers/homeowners
 - Presentation on example tools and resources available
- Group discussion and brainstorm on the types of tools Clark County should develop as part of this project
- Report out from group discussion
- Moving forward: utilizing consent-based process to determine next steps

Welcome

Adrienne introduced herself and kicked off the meeting. Katie reviewed the agenda and goals for the meeting and initiated a round of introductions.

Background on SARD Project

Katie gave a brief overview of Cascadia Region Green Building Council. Cascadia's mission is to promote the design, construction and operation of buildings in Alaska, British Columbia, Washington and Oregon that are environmentally responsible, profitable and healthy places to live, work and learn. Cascadia is currently helping Clark County in establishing a regional sustainable strategy. This meeting marks the second phase of this effort, aimed at creating some type of tool or resource to be used by builders/developers in order to incorporate and promote sustainable development practices. This is the first of three meetings to begin work on this tool/resource package. This series of meetings will focus on collecting ideas and soliciting feedback from potential users on the possible content and delivery method for a tool/resource package. The project is funded through a grant provided by the Department of Ecology.

Katie provided some background on the Sustainable Affordable Residential Development (SARD) project and how it relates to this effort. The purpose of the Sustainable Communities project is to take the information developed from the SARD report and make it more applicable on a regional level by exploring the development of effective tools and resources for use by the private building community.

Katie introduced Pete DuBois, Sustainability Coordinator for Clark County Public Works. Pete explained that this grant was provided to Clark County by the Department of Ecology to bring the stakeholders together to brainstorm solutions that will hopefully result in something that is useful to everyone. Today's goal is to go through a brainstorming and consensus-building process to better define what this tool needs to be. Pete explained that the previous meetings of this effort (Phase 1: meetings 1 through 3) focused on local jurisdictions, and an intergovernmental agreement. He said that the County is currently partnering with a local non-profit called Community Choices in order to advance discussions amongst local elected officials regarding the regional adoption of an intergovernmental agreement that promotes sustainable building/development practices and innovative models of land use, transportation, and resource-efficient residential/mixed use projects. Pete emphasized that effort really needs to be discussed and agreed upon at both levels (government and the private sector).

Local Builders Leading the Way: Lessons Learned

Chuck Dougherty, of Synergy Design, briefly talked about his experiences with green building projects in the area. His projects have been mostly on residential scale. Incorporating alternative materials into these projects required extra effort to document the materials used and in general there was some initial resistance -- but in the end the projects were successful. He said projects using alternative materials can be done, but its more taxing time-wise.

Anya asked how many straw bale houses are in the Clark County. No one was sure, making her point that the information is not readily available for people who are interested in building such structures. Katie said it is common for a "trailblazer" to not pass along their information or experience to other builders and that this is an opportunity for learning how to do things differently or better in the future.

Developing tools to support builders/developers/homeowners

Katie presented a PowerPoint presentation on various case studies in and around the Pacific Northwest that provide example tools and resources currently available. This presentation can be reviewed at:

<http://www.clark.wa.gov/sard/docs.html>

Small Group Discussion

Katie and Adrienne led two small group discussions focused on soliciting feedback on the information that is most needed for a future resource that will promote and incorporate sustainable practices in local development projects, including what method it might be delivered in (i.e. online, print materials, video, etc.).

The following is a summary of the group discussions.

GROUP 1 -

Types of Info:

- Identify what tools are most used currently
- Installation training on new products/alternative materials (for subs)
- Timeframe for building/installation of new products/alternative materials
- Distribute/promote of available technology and information (i.e. trade journals)
- Performance path standard
- Database of homes with energy efficient certifications or green certifications
- Consumer cost benefit analysis and timelines (How long it takes for return on investment/ROI)
- Product performance (liability)
- Assessed Value – lifetime costs
- Planning side needs financial info
- Homeowners manual (how to use alternative products/practices in the home)
- Localized list of incentives
- What is Germany doing?
- Appraised value (create a market)
- Fast tracked permitting

Delivery Method:

- Online – Virtual FAQ
- Workshops (trade or consumer based), topic based
- Community-based showcase house/demo project, involve the trades
- Topic based tours
- Online video
- Community demonstration projects – hands-on learning and involvement
- School based program
- Business involvement
- Planning Commission 1st Tuesday workshops
- Multimedia
- Marketing Campaign - Branded identity and logo
- Leverage partnerships for promo (i.e. commercials for builders)
- PUD/utility inserts – broad based advertising.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish breaks on permits for using energy efficient products • Implement incentives from other jurisdictions (best practices) • Integrate resources (comprehensive) • FAQs and other resources • How to integrate on planning/zoning side (i.e. establish and identify green zones) • Provide information on all local jurisdictions/public websites (incentives and benefits) 	
--	--

Group 2 -

Types of Info:

Delivery Method:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to info between peers and code officials • Water recycling technologies – waste water, grey water reuse • Zoning • SARD barriers • Code flexibility (land use spec) • Index of financial incentives in place • Documenting alternative methods. • Listing analysis of most impactful methods and approaches with pros/cons. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational • Videoconferencing • County pilot projects • Preliminary meetings with planning • Code guidance • Print materials • Wiki site, online building codes, alternative methods.
---	---

Consensus Building

After the two groups reported out, Adrienne conducted an agreement scale exercise to evaluate the ideas generated by the small groups. Topics were rated from “most essential” to “least essential”.

1. Web-based: all agreed this was most essential.
2. Pilot project: Mike Bomar commented that he did not feel it was as essential as a web-based tool. Marty raised concern about how people will access the project; the group agreed that perhaps it can tie into something web-based. All agreed this was somewhat essential.
3. Training (consumers and developers)/tours/webinars: Most agreed this was somewhat essential; although there was some reservations related to the focus on trade workers vs. builders and developers. It was suggested that possible trade related training could focus on alternative product installation/ grey water recycling.

Closing and Next Steps

Katie wrapped up the meeting and explained the next steps. The next meeting will be held on February 18th from 4 to 6 p.m. at the CTRAN Fisher's Landing Transit Center. The project team anticipates presenting a draft outline for the future tool/resource package at the February 18th meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:00 p.m.